

Date: Sat, 23 Jul 94 04:30:07 PDT  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #324  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Sat, 23 Jul 94 Volume 94 : Issue 324

## Today's Topics:

Home address or PO box on 610  
reply  
short cuts  
Thoughts on CW testin  
Thoughts on CW testing

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available (by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Fri, 22 Jul 1994 14:23:34 GMT

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!convex!news.duke.edu!godot.cc.duq.edu!  
newsfeed.pitt.edu!gvls1!rossi@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Home address or P0 box on 610  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1994Jul20.214454.25912@hitachi.com> kirk@hitachi.com writes:

>

>You have two addresses to provide. One is your mailing address and the other  
>is the location of your transmitter. Your mailing address can be where ever  
>you want. Your transmitter address should be where you transmitter is.

>

>They can be the same but your transmitter address can't be a P.O. box.

The new 610 forms (then only 610 form that will be accepted now) has space for only ONE address. Just a mailing address. No more station location.

If you have more than one mailing address then just pick your favorite.

A real street address would probably be better though since it also gives an indication as to your actual location but a PO BOX is acceptable.

Just make sure that you **\*do\*** get mail at that address in case the FCC ever tries to contact you.

Pete Rossi - WA3NNA rossi@vfl.paramax.COM

Unisys Corporation - Government Systems Group  
Valley Forge Engineering Center - Paoli, Pennsylvania

Date: Fri, 22 Jul 1994 03:59:02 GMT  
From: psinntp!arrl.org!zlau@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: reply  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

kevin jessup (kevin.jessup@mixcom.mixcom.com) wrote:

: Why are points not awarded for equipment of one's own design? Why, in fact,  
: are there ABSOLUTELY NO ARRL competitions involved with DESIGN? IMO, this  
: is a serious problem with amateur radio today. The "this is a hobby not a  
: career" camp should take a closer look at other hobbies! Then again,  
: perhaps they prefer to place amateur radio on the same level as basket  
: weaving and finger-painting.

Why should points be awarded? Its tough enough competing with the likes of K1FO and W6OHS without giving them an additional edge. :-).

I find it interesting to see how much contestants have contributed to the amateur literature--not only in the development of antennas, but in other areas such as circuit design.

Maybe in the UHF contest I'll get a chance to try out my over the horizon 10 GHz WBFM setup....then I can write it up...

--  
Zack Lau KH6CP/1 2 way QRP WAS  
Internet: [zlaumarr.org](mailto:zlaumarr.org) 8 States on 10 GHz  
10 grids on 2304 MHz

Date: Fri, 22 Jul 94 11:16:55 GMT  
From: elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!pipex!lyra.csx.cam.ac.uk!  
doc.ic.ac.uk!cs.city.ac.uk!city!nick@ames.arpa

Subject: short cuts  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <5c.7546.22.0N17D730@pplace.com>,  
Pat Wilson <pat.wilson@pplace.com> wrote:  
>I don't know if the person who complained about IMHO or IMNSHO is  
>listening, but these short cuts have nothing to do with amateur radio,  
>but are simply computer-ease (yes, I know) for things that MOST who use  
>the keyboard are aware.  
>  
>RTFM = read the f\*\*\*ing manual.

I was told this was "read the FRIENDLY manual" ; -)

You missed:

TTFN	- ta-ta for now
BRB	- be right back (not used much in news, mostly chatservers)
OIC	- Oh, I see
CUL8r	- see you later

And probably quite a few more.

Also if anyone doesn't already know about smilies, they deserve a mention:

:-)	standard smiley
;-)	winking smiley
:-(	sad smiley
:-0	shocked smiley
:-)>	bearded smiley
8-)	smiley with glasses
:)	2-byte smiley
:()	etc... etc... etc...

There are loads more, but those are the most significant. If don't understand them, lean your head to the left.

Nick

--  
Nick Waterman - inet nick@cimio.co.uk - ax25 G7RZQ @ GB7GFD.#42.GBR.EU  
"Out of paper error reading drive C:" - MS-DOS  
None of the opinions above belong to anybody at all, probably.

-----  
Date: Fri, 22 Jul 94 08:18:00 -0400

From: hearst.acc.Virginia.EDU!pplace!pat.wilson@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: Thoughts on CW testin  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

->  
-> Catch you on the lower 25Kc!  
-> Paul N6HCS/M  
->

Ok, see ya there. But there are a few folks in here we won't see in that portion anytime soon (grin).

N0RDQ

---

Date: Fri, 22 Jul 1994 09:22:58  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!newsxfer.itd.umich.edu!  
zip.eecs.umich.edu!yeshua.marcam.com!news.kei.com!ddsw1!mbi.moody.edu!  
farslayer.moody.edu!pwalker@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Thoughts on CW testing  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <carreiroCtC0A7.LAI@netcom.com> carreiro@netcom.com (Paul Carreiro) writes:

>I would favor the relaxation (or yes, gulp, the elimination) of the CW  
>requirement only if the technical / regulatory portions (all that's left)  
>of all the tests were significantly increased in difficulty. Yes, CW has  
>been used as a check valve for all levels of license. It's probably time to  
>shift that check valve to the technical / regulatory knowledge arena.

>I think the easiest change to the exam system would be the elimination of  
>the publicly available question pools. Question pools are fine, as long as they  
>are not the exact questions used on ANY of the tests. I was able to study  
>all I needed, and was forced to understand the material by using the FCC  
>provided study outlines for all of my tests.

You touched on most everything I thought of while I was testing for my license. Please note that the following statement is not bragging, only a fact of what a motivated person can do under the current testing scheme:

I passed the Novice and Technician Theory for a No-Code license on 1/8/94. On 3/5/94 I passed the Extra Class Theory and 20 WPM code for the Extra Class upgrade. On 3/7/94 (two days later) my No-Code Tech license arrived in the mail. Twenty minutes later I went on the air as N9WHG/AE.

Was this difficult? IMO --- no it was not. The toughest part was the 20 wpm code requirement. I had testing sessions available to me every other week if I wanted to use them. The most technically demanding test probably was the Advanced theory. But, C'mon! The questions on electronics were all variations on a theme --- change the numbers (maybe switch a couple words) and viola - a new question.

Now I realize I am calling into scrutiny the very method to which I obtained my license, but I did obtain my license by the "book" - so to speak.

I am sure there will be follow-ups, so I will save any meager defense for my actions for rebuttals.

Paul, N9WHG

---

Date: Fri, 22 Jul 1994 14:03:58 GMT  
From: agate!darkstar.UCSC.EDU!news.hal.COM!olivea!charnel.ecst.csuchico.edu!  
yeshua.marcam.com!zip.eecs.umich.edu!newsxfer.itd.umich.edu!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!  
emory!cs.utk.edu!@ihnp4.ucsd.edu  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <30h7mk\$a18@chnews.intel.com>, <417@ted.win.net><30mno7\$352@chnews.intel.com>, <419@ted.win.net>mich  
Subject : Re: CW ... My view.

In article <419@ted.win.net> mjsilva@ted.win.net (Michael Silva) writes:

>I recognize that this is not an either-or discussion. In a hobby with  
>600k members, everyone can have fun in their own sandbox. I think we  
>should all try to nudge the hobby in directions we think are valuable,  
>rather than letting it drift aimlessly. One of my interests is that  
>we not loose track of the centrality of RF generation and detection in  
>the hobby. ^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^

>Mike, KK6GM

I couldn't agree more! I think that some of the current ills of the amateur service are brought on by folks interested only in turning it into a "common carrier" operation just to beat commercial carrier tariffs. This will, in turn, allow them to transport and manipulate information (much of it commercial, irrelevant to amateur radio, and unregulated) without paying for it.

Others would put RF generation and detection far, far in the background with

digital experimentation in the foreground. But should we then have incentive license exams with equivalent degrees of difficulty with questions concerning gate formation and minimization theory (Karnough maps, de Morgan's theorem, error detection and correction algorithms)? Heaven forbid! They want to use the amateur frequencies (all of it) without working for it or proving they are capable and responsible, and they are not going to value anything that stands in their way.

73,  
C. C. (Clay) Wynn N4AOX  
wyn@ornl.gov

= Cooperation requires participation. Competition teaches cooperation. =

-----

Date: 22 Jul 1994 06:41:10 GMT  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!spool.mu.edu!news.clark.edu!  
netnews.nwnet.net!news.u.washington.edu!cummings@network.ucsd.edu  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1994Jul21.132726.6704@mixcom.mixcom.com>, <30mdm1\$spr@nyx10.cs.du.edu>, <1994Jul21.224341.28215@mixcom.mixcom.com>p  
Subject : Re: reply

In article <1994Jul21.224341.28215@mixcom.mixcom.com>, kevin jessup <kevin.jessup@mixcom.mixcom.com> wrote:  
>In <30mdm1\$spr@nyx10.cs.du.edu> jmaynard@nyx10.cs.du.edu (Jay Maynard) writes:  
>  
>>You mean like, say, learning how to convey information rapidly and  
>>efficiently under extremely adverse conditions?

>I assume you are referring to long distance comms via a CW.

How did you read that into the above?

>That is ONE  
>example of MANY adverse condition possibilities. I can add DSP to  
>anything you do in CW and make it better.

>Nice try at twisting an argument about technical competence back around to the  
>"merits" of cw. Hahhhh!

You're the only one mentioning CW here.

Mike Cummings NX7E cummings@u.washington.edu  
"Like jewels in a crown, the precious stones glittered in the Queen's round metal hat." - Jack Handey

Date: Fri, 22 Jul 1994 09:42:59 GMT

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!ns.mcs.kent.edu!  
kira.cc.uakron.edu!malgudi.oar.net!witch!ted!mjsilva@network.ucsd.edu  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <404@ted.win.net>, <30h7mk\$a18@chnews.intel.com>,

<417@ted.win.net><30mno7\$352@chnews.intel.com>udi.oa

Reply-To : mjsilva@ted.win.net (Michael Silva)

Subject : Re: CW ... My view.

In article <30mn07\$352@chnews.intel.com>, Jim Bromley, W5GYJ (jbromley@sedona.intel.com) writes:

>>> Michael Silva, KK6GM wrote: <mjsilva@ted.win.net> wrote:

>

>> The only thing I would say to this is that amateur radio is a hobby  
>> with RF at it's core. I hope we don't end up with a whole class of  
>> licencees who start with an off-the-shelf radio and go from there.

>

>

>I write:

>

>That is about all that's expected from commercial radio technicians  
>these days. And that skill level is the one that amateur radio  
>strives for.

>

>The technology has changed. Most of the rf signal-processing  
>functions are modularized and encapsulated, either as integrated  
>circuits, hybrid modules or surface-mount PC boards. All of the  
>practical work is done at the interfaces.

While I don't disagree with you, there are more RF transmitters and receivers around today than ever before. Somebody is designing and putting them together. Is it really naive of me to think that a radio amateur should have a good idea of what is going on between the microphone connector and the antenna jack?

>

>

>>I have always felt that we have got it completely backwards in putting  
>>new hams with minimal knowledge (some have much more, but that's all  
>>the test requires) on VHF+, where I think experimenting tends to be

>>more difficult, and expectations for equipment higher. I think the  
>>combination of those three factors ends up killing the experimenting  
>>impulse in a lot of newcomers.

>

>It changes it. Antenna work is much easier and more instructive there  
>than at lower frequencies. Circuitry is more critical in some respects,  
>but also more \*interesting\*. Because of high-reliability, modularized  
>components, trouble-shooting takes place at the systems level. But  
>the level of complexity is about the same as dealing with older,  
>discrete-component gear.

>

Quite true about antenna work. As far as the circuitry, I agree that  
for someone who works with it on a regular basis it's gotten fairly  
cut-and-dried, but I still believe that the card-table experimenter is  
at a distinct disadvantage trying to do VHF work vs. HF work.

I recognize that this is not an either-or discussion. In a hobby with  
600k members, everyone can have fun in their own sandbox. I think we  
should all try to nudge the hobby in directions we think are valuable,  
rather than letting it drift aimlessly. One of my interests is that  
we not loose track of the centrality of RF generation and detection in  
the hobby.

Thanks to all for an enjoyable discussion

Mike, KK6GM

---

-----  
End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #324  
\*\*\*\*\*